

III. REMARKS

Claims 13-25, 29, and 30 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 9-12, 27, and 28 have been cancelled and claims 13 and 29 have been amended.

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116(b) because the Amendment: (a) places the application in condition for allowance as discussed below; (b) does not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration; and (c) places the application in better form for appeal. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request entry of this Amendment.

Applicant does not acquiesce in the correctness of the objections and rejections and reserves the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Final Office Action, claim 29 is objected to, alleging that "first" in lines 9 and 12 should read "particulate filter." Claim 29 has been amended to replace each such instance of "first" with "particulate filter." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection.

In the Final Office Action, claims 9-25 and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Specifically, with respect to each of claims 9, 24, and 27 (and apparently claim 29 as well), the Office alleges that it is unclear where the phrase "carrying a length" is disclosed in the specification. Applicant believes that the Office may be confused as to the language of the claim. The phrase "carrying a length" does not appear in any of the rejected claims. Applicant assumes that the Office is referring to the phrase "varying a length," which appears in each of the rejected claims, as previously amended. Support for the phrase can be found on pages 3-5, 7, and 16 of the instant application, which disclose attachable filter units for varying the size of a filter system. Support is also found in the figures of the instant application, particularly FIGS. 1 and 4, which show attachable filter units for varying the length

of a filter system. Applicant asserts, therefore, that the rejected claims are not indefinite and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Applicant appreciates the indication that claims 13-25 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection above and that claims 29-30 are allowed. Claim 13 has been amended to include the substance of claim 9. As explained above, claims 9 and 24 are not indefinite, support for the claim language of each being found in both the written description and figures of the instant application. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that each of claims 13-25 is allowable.

In the Final Office Action, claims 9-12, 27, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over various prior art references. Each of these claims has been cancelled.

Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is necessary to place the application in better condition for allowance, he is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Spencer K. Warnick
Reg. No. 40,398

Date: 11/22/05

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)